

Government will not refuse to gratify the public curiosity when the matter comes up, as we suppose it will in some shape, for debate. Meanwhile it is noteworthy that some of the organs supposed to be in the confidence of the administration are beginning to sound again the praises of the National Policy. This, together with other intimations to the effect that no important tariff changes will be proposed during the current session may probably warrant the inference that the Government have nothing better to propose. It may be that nothing better is just now possible, but we cannot believe that the country, with all the "grand resources" and "glorious possibilities" of which we hear so much, will settle down and content itself with a policy which has brought no better results than the standing still in population which the census reveals. Cannot the Government or its press give us a little ray of hope?

WE have before us as we write a copy of the *Empire* in which columns of figures are given to show the growth of certain lines of manufacture in the Dominion during the last decade. On these statistics the *Empire* bases the following argument:—

A glance over the figures will show that in many lines Canada is now manufacturing for herself where she formerly imported, and that the increase in our population of workingmen and artisans must have been correspondingly large. Where would these people have gone during these thirteen years if they had not had manufacturing pursuits to turn to? Stayed on the farms? We know from the experience of England, Germany, the United States, almost every country in the world, as a matter of fact, that they would not have done so.

Without staying to enquire whether a young and vigorous country might not be reasonably expected to make some progress in manufacturing industries without artificial stimulus, we should like to ask whether there is no escape from the pessimistic conclusion to which this reasoning seems to shut us up, viz., that it was only by virtue of the National Policy that the country was saved from positive loss of population during these last years, and that, therefore, the best we are justified in hoping for in the future is that under the benign influence of high taxes—the best possible system for us, in the estimation of the great majority of our legislators—we shall scarcely do more than hold our own? We have certainly done little more during these past years, so far as population is concerned. And now we are taught that but for the beneficent effects of the N.P. we should have lost large numbers of those workingmen and artisans whom it kept in the country by providing work for them. Our case must be a hard one if this is the best that can be done for us.

LORD SALISBURY'S answer to the last despatch from Washington on the Behring Sea question has arrived, but at the time of this writing its purport has not been given to the American public. The fact that such temporary reticence is being observed gives a colour of probability to a rumour which reaches us from the other side of the ocean, to the effect that the British Premier firmly adheres to his refusal to agree to a renewal of the *modus vivendi* for another year unless the American Government will consent to assume liability for compensation to sealers, in case the arbitrators should decide against the main contention of the United States. Assuming for a moment the correctness of this report, is it in the least degree likely that the United States Government will accede to such a condition? We fear not, save on the counter condition that the British Government assume liability to American citizens should the contention of their Government be sustained. Looking at it from as nearly a neutral point of view as possible, it is not very apparent why the rule should not work both ways. In either case it would be somewhat like a fresh application of the principle of consequential damages, of which Great Britain no doubt had enough on a former memorable occasion, though in view of the attitude of the United States in the Alabama arbitration her Government could not very logically object to that principle. From the British and Canadian point of view, should the United States' claim to a protectorate over and a proprietary interest in the seals in Behring Sea be found untenable, it would be but fair and just that that nation should be required to make good the very serious losses inflicted under that claim upon what would have been, by hypothesis, declared to be a perfectly legitimate industry. But, on the other hand, should the claim of the American Government—to us an almost impossible supposition—be allowed, it would, from the American

point of view, seem equally fair and just that Great Britain and Canada should be required to make good the value of all the seals which have been on that hypothesis wrongfully taken by our fishermen from our neighbour's preserve. Probably our chief difficulty in seeing the other side of the shield arises from what seems to us the almost un-supposable nature of the hypothesis of the success of the United States' claim in the arbitration. And yet we cannot conceal from ourselves the fact that, for some reason which we need not just now try to discover, Britain is not a favourite of fortune before international tribunals. But to come down to the very serious practical question, while we are not prepared to say that Lord Salisbury should have given way in this instance—that depends largely, it seems to us, upon the prior question who was to blame for the long delay in fixing the terms of the arbitration—we see great reason to fear that this unfortunate dispute may lead, not to absolute rupture—the idea of war between the two nations over such a matter seems too absurd and horrible to be even thought of—but to an indefinite postponement of the arbitration, with all the vexation and danger of bad blood involved in such delay.

THE introduction in the Dominion Parliament of Mr. McCarthy's Bill to repeal the dual language and separate school provisions of the North-West Act suggests the renewal of the struggle which is probably not far distant in respect to Manitoba. The principle involved is substantially the same in both sections. That principle is still being earnestly discussed in Manitoba. We have just been reading what is perhaps the latest important contribution to it, in the shape of two vigorous pamphlets by Mr. John S. Ewart, of Winnipeg. The first is "An Open Letter" to the Hon. Thomas Greenway; the second "A Reply to Criticisms," reprinted from the *Manitoba Free Press*. In these pamphlets we have the advantage of a forcible re-statement of the arguments in favour of the separate school system by a clever advocate who is at the same time a Liberal, and consequently on general principles a supporter of the party by whom the law abolishing that system has been put upon the statute book. Into the charges of bad faith which Mr. Ewart presses against Mr. Greenway and his Government we need not enter, as they do not affect the general argument. Mr. Ewart does not rest his case upon the Constitutional question, hence we are free from the complication which is caused by that issue. His letters are a frank and able attempt to defend the discarded system on its merits, and as such are worthy of careful study by every one who wishes to reach a sound conclusion in regard to the right and wrong of a controversy which is likely, at no distant day, to stir the whole Dominion, and in the final settlement of which the future peace and progress of the great North-West provinces of Canada may in no small degree be involved. Within the limits which necessarily circumscribe our discussion of such a matter we can attempt nothing more than to point out what seem to us to be certain misconceptions or invalid assumptions upon which Mr. Ewart's arguments are based and the removal of which would cause the whole structure to topple. The most fundamental of these misconceptions or assumptions is that contained in the following and similar passages:—

It is upon this point, the character of education, that Protestants and Catholics are fundamentally at variance; not whether children shall be educated (on that they are agreed), but what shall be the character of the education. The great majority of Protestants think that secular education during the week, with little more than the acknowledgment of the Deity twice a day, is good enough for their children. A true Roman Catholic abhors this system and insists upon all education being permeated with religion. A Protestant is trained secularly, and religion is relegated to Sunday. A Roman Catholic is trained to be religious as well as intelligent all days of the week.

Again:—

As you see, sir, and know, the Protestants are satisfied with the non-sectarian schools—the vestige (of religion) being still visible, and they will be satisfied with nothing else. It is useless, therefore, to assert that they give up something for uniformity's sake, and to argue that Catholics should be willing to follow their example. They give up nothing, but Catholics are asked to surrender what to them is sacred.

We maintain that it is a misconception to regard the question as one between Catholics and Protestants. It is rather a question between Catholics (primarily the Catholic clergy) and all other classes of citizens. It is a misconception, not to use a stronger term, to say that Protestants (note the unfairness of making the compari-

son between Protestants generally and true Roman Catholics) think that "secular education during the week etc.," is good enough for them, and that they surrender nothing. The true Protestant certainly attaches no less value to religion as an indispensable factor in all education, every day in the week, than the most devout Roman Catholic. The difference is that he, as a citizen of the state, recognizes the rights of all other citizens and declines to force the teaching of his own religious views upon them or their children, and as both Christian and citizen he denies that it is within either the power or the duty of the state to provide for genuine religious teaching. He also refuses to acknowledge the right of the state to make him a party by legislation and taxation to the training of a large class of the future citizens under a regime which he honestly believes to be adapted to make them both worse citizens and worse Christians.

WE venture to hope that the distinctions pointed out in the foregoing remarks, and their fundamental relation to the whole argument, will without further enlargement be sufficiently obvious to any one who will take the trouble to consider them carefully. The fact is, as we understand it, that thoughtful Protestants are very far from being satisfied with a purely secular education, or regarding such an education as in any sense a complete or ideal one. They are fully persuaded that only as it is constantly accompanied and supplemented with religious training by parents and religious teachers can it be regarded as taking in the whole or the highest part of the child nature and faculties. But, agreeing heartily with the principle laid down and advocated by Mr. Ewart, in his second pamphlet, viz., that "the state has nothing to do with religion," they draw from it a conclusion which is the direct opposite of that reached by Mr. Ewart. Instead of reasoning thus: "The state has nothing to do with religion and cannot possibly decide what is true religion and what is not, therefore it should enter into partnership with a professedly religious body which claims to have the true religion, and put the public schools, to a large extent, into the hands of such a body;" they say: "The state has nothing to do with religion, therefore it should have nothing to do with the teaching of it, nor should it tax any class of citizens for the purpose of teaching any system of religion whatever, but content itself with leaving the whole subject to the voluntary efforts of the various religious bodies which have it in hand, merely protecting individual liberty of conscience." They see clearly that the primary responsibility for the education of children belongs not to the state but to the parents, and that the state's right to intervene is merely derived and inferential, arising out of its obligation to protect the state from the injurious effects of ignorance and to secure at least that minimum of intelligence in its citizens which is necessary to its self-preservation. They therefore regard the public school system as an expedient, the best practicable, for securing this minimum of universal intelligence. The secularization of the schools they regard as a compromise growing out of the necessities of the situation and the only means of securing to the individual freedom of conscience in matters of faith. At the same time they desire that the state should afford every reasonable facility for the teaching of religion by the various churches in connection with the schools, though never as a part of the school machinery, or in any wise at the expense of the state which, it is agreed, cannot decide what is true religion and what is not. Religion, they hold, is in its very nature voluntary, and its fundamental principles are violated the moment the funds of the state, derived from compulsory taxation, are used in its support, whether those funds are contributed by Catholics or Protestants, or by those who are neither the one nor the other, but whose rights of citizenship are just as sacred as those of the most pronounced religionists. And this reminds us of another assumption which is, we conceive, invalid and misleading, but is nevertheless vital to whatever force or plausibility there may be in much of Mr. Ewart's reasoning. That assumption is expressed in the following sentence: "With the exception of the cities there are very few places in which the population is of a mixed character. In the districts in which the Catholics have schools, there are very few and sometimes no Protestants." Granting that these statements are accurate at the present moment, have the "very few" Protestants no rights, because they are very few? Again, under the local management system which is happily characteristic of all our free school methods, a purely Catholic section would as a matter of course have